



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,903	10/01/2003	Vanita Mani	123860/YOD GERD:0040	8076

7590
Patrick S. Yoder
Fletcher Yoder
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

PATEL, RITA RAMESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1792

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/676,903	Applicant(s) MANI ET AL.	
	Examiner RITA R. PATEL	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-27,29-33 and 70-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-27,29-33 and 80-85 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-15,70-79 and 86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Applicant's Arguments / Amendments

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 3/14/08. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-27, 29-33, and 70-86 are pending. Claims 16-27, 29-33, and 80-85 are currently withdrawn from consideration. Claims 16, 80, 82, and 82 have been amended. Claim 86 is new.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Thus, claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 70-79, and 86 are finally rejected for the reasons of record.

Applicant argues two major issues, firstly Applicant argued that the prior art Renzacci fails to teach an evaporator configured to cool air downstream of the air outlet which is disposed in a closed fluid path.

Secondly Applicant argues that the prior art Renzacci fails to teach a condenser configured to heat air upstream of the air inlet which is disposed in a closed fluid path.

However it is maintained that the prior art, Renzacci, teaches both a condenser 26 (condenser) and cooling unit 7 (evaporator) which as illustrated in Figure 1, and connected via a closed loop process. The condenser 26 is connected to the pump 22 which delivers the solvent spray to the washing tank as denoted by arrow 23 (column 1, lines 62-67; column 2, lines 1-3). The cooling unit 7 is connected to the outlet of the washing tank as shown in Figure 1. As per the Renzacci reference the condenser 26 is a condenser and thus reads on claims wherein a condenser is configured to heat; the

cooling unit 7 performs cooling functions and thus reads on claims wherein an evaporator is configured to cool.

Moreover, the condenser 26 (condenser) and cooling unit 7 (evaporator) are disposed in a loop formed between the air inlet and outlet of the washing machine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 70, 74, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Renzacci (US Patent No. 5,887,454).

Renzacci teaches a dry cleaning machine for linen and garments which includes a rotating drum 2 (agitation device) containing items to be washing, rotating inside a washing tank 1. The tank has an inlet pipe 8 (air inlet), outlet pipe 5 (air outlet), condenser 26 (condenser), and cooling unit 7 (evaporator). A solvent distiller 3 is adapted to recapture a portion of the cleaning fluid. Tank 26 reads on Applicant's claims for a cleaning solvent tank coupled to the laundry enclosure.

A drying air circulation system, generally indicated as 4, connects the air inlet 8 and outlet 5. Fan 6 reads on Applicant's claims for a blowing device. Renzacci teaches a heat exchanger 15 is installed in the drying air circuit downstream from preheating unit 19 (supplemental heating device) and cooling unit 7 (cooling device). A condensate

return pipe 16 (condensate drain/fluid drain) connects the heat exchange to sump 11a of the solvent distiller 3 (fluid recovery system). Pressure is controlled within this apparatus by a pressure sensing device 21 (pressure reducing mechanism) (col. 2, lines 33-36). Finally, as it appears illustrated, the laundry drum is side-loadable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 15, 71, and 75-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renzacci.

Renzacci teaches a rotating drum 2 inside tank 1. It is at once envisaged by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the rotating drum is connected and moved rotatingly by a conventional rotating shaft.

Renzacci illustrates the washing machine to be side-loading, however, it is commonly known in the art to have such laundry machines as side- or top-loading. Choice in aesthetic designs was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11, (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Side- and top-loading laundry machines perform the same, except they merely provide a desired aesthetic; side-loading means may be desirable when little space is available for said machine and the washer and dryers are stacked on top of one another, on the

Art Unit: 1792

corollary, a top-loading machine may be desirable when it is preferred by the user to remove clothes from the top, rather than from the side because in a side-loading machine the clothes may all tumble out when opened after a wash cycle or be harder to reach because the opening is too low to the ground. Top- and side-loading laundry machines are commonly interchangeable and known in the art; both these types of openings achieve equivalent washing functions.

Furthermore, Renzacci discloses heating and cooling the air within said apparatus, however, Renzacci does not recite specific drying temperatures or airflow rates. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize these features of Goldberg since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Optimizing air temperatures and airflow in a drying machine is merely a result effective variable and has no patentable significance because a known and expected drying result is produced.

Claims 6, 72, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renzacci as applied to claims above, and further in view of Berndt et al. herein referred to as "Berndt" (US Patent No. 6,059,845).

Renzacci teaches a cleaning solvent is used to clean the laundry in its washing machine, however, Renzacci fails to recite what the cleaning solvent is comprised of. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

use siloxane as a cleaning fluid in Renzacci, since siloxane is a commonly known and used dry cleaning solution used in laundering garments, linens, etc.

Berndt provides motivation for this teaching by disclosing a laundry processing apparatus which uses the solvent siloxane from either a working tank 14 or a new solvent tank 16. Berndt's disclosure of a working tank teaches the recapture and reuse of a cleaning solvent. Moreover, Renzacci reinforces the idea of recycling cleaning fluid by teaching the cleaning solution may be collected and re-used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use siloxane in the laundry apparatus of Renzacci, as taught by the laundry apparatus of Berndt to be a known cleaning fluid in the art. Laundry machines are commonly known in the art to have cleaning fluid sources to clean items therein as desired; commonly known cleaning fluids are water, cleaning solvents, detergents, fabric softeners, etc.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1792

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RITA R. PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1792

/Rita R. Patel/

Application/Control Number: 10/676,903
Art Unit: 1792

Page 8

Examiner, Art Unit 1792